

Disordered Boson Systems: A Perturbative Study

Lizeng Zhang

Department of Physics and Astronomy,

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-1200

A hard-core disordered boson system is mapped onto a quantum spin $1/2$ XY-model with transverse random fields. It is then generalized to a system of spins with an arbitrary magnitude S and studied through a $1/S$ expansion. The first order $1/S$ expansion corresponds to a spin-wave theory. The effect of weak disorder is studied perturbatively within such a first order $1/S$ scheme. We compute the reduction of the speed of sound and the life time of the Bloch phonons in the regime of weak disorder. Generalizations of the present study to the strong disordered regime are discussed.

PACS numbers: 67.40.Db, 67.40.Yv, 05.30.Jp, 75.10.Nr

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent experiments on liquid He^4 in vycor and other porous media [1] have revealed some interesting features of disordered boson systems. For a boson system at low temperature, strong disorder may destroy superfluidity and transforms it onto a Bose-glass phase. While many theoretical efforts have been devoted to this disorder-tuned quantum critical phenomenon [2]– [9], some important issues are yet to be explored and to be understood. Like it in the fermion system, study of the nature of low energy excitations is extremely important to the understanding of the macroscopic properties. In this paper we study the properties of low energy excitations in weakly disordered boson systems and their effects on superfluidity. This is of interest both to compare to the pure case, and to study the precursor to the destruction of superfluidity. Although the experiment on superconductor-insulator transition in dirty films [10] is an extremely interesting possible realization of disordered boson systems [9], the present paper will be restricted to the study of dirty bosons with short-ranged interaction, which is suited to model systems like He^4 in random media.

As usual in theoretical physics, one may wish to proceed the study by starting with a perturbation theory about some known limiting cases. However, it is clear that the non-interacting system is not a suitable starting point, since disorder will cause a (artificial) Bose-Einstein condensation of bosons onto the lowest energy, hence *localized* state. This condensate is unstable with respect to arbitrary weak but finite repulsions between bosons. Therefore it is essential to include the interaction between bosons to proceed the study of the effect of disorder. Since the condensate is no longer uniform in the presence of disorder, the self-consistency required for the normal Hartree theory imposes a set of non-linear equations on the condensate which are not solvable in general. In this paper, we adopt an alternative approach. We start by considering a model of lattice hard-core bosons with random potential, introduced by Ma, Halperin and Lee [2]:

$$\mathcal{H} = -t \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} b_i^\dagger b_j + H.c + \sum_j (W_j - \mu) b_j^\dagger b_j \quad , \quad (1)$$

where b_j^+ , b_j are boson creation and annihilation operators at lattice site j , with the hard-core constraint $b_j^+ b_j = 0, 1$. $\langle i, j \rangle$ indicates nearest neighbor and W_j is the random on-site potential obeys certain (independent) distribution. This model is equivalent to a quantum spin 1/2 XY-model with transverse random fields [2]:

$$\mathcal{H} = -J \sum_{\langle i, j \rangle} (S_i^x S_j^x + S_i^y S_j^y) - \sum_j h_j S_j^z, \quad (2)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} S_j^+ &\longleftrightarrow b_j^+, & S_j^- &\longleftrightarrow b_j^-, \\ J &\longleftrightarrow 2t, & h_j &\longleftrightarrow \mu - W_j. \end{aligned}$$

Superfluidity in the boson model (1) corresponds to a spin long range order in the XY plane. Thinking of the boson problem in terms of the spin language and vice versa is proven to be a fruitful way in understanding the physics of these problems [2,4,5]. For the most part of the paper, we shall devote ourselves to investigate the ground state properties.

Above mapping is an exact mathematical transformation. Now we apply approximations in term of the spin language. We start by letting the magnitude of the spins to have an arbitrary (integer or half integer) value S , roughly corresponding to relaxing the hard core condition and letting the site occupation number of bosons $b_j^+ b_j = 0, 1, \dots, 2S$. When $S \rightarrow \infty$, (2) describes a system of classical spins and the usual mean field theory becomes exact. We study this Hamiltonian through a $1/S$ expansion. When finite S is considered, one introduces quantum fluctuations as well as stronger on-site repulsions between bosons. To the first order of $1/S$, this expansion describes the Gaussian fluctuations and corresponds to a generalized spin wave theory, where the magnons correspond to the phonon excitations in the boson system. Since in the classical case the long range order persists up to the infinitely strong disorder limit (provided that the probability distribution for the random field h_j , $P(h_j)$, is finite at its mean value) [2], the expansion is assumed to be inside the superfluid phase. In the end, we will discuss the possibility of probing the transition to the disordered phase within this approach.

Our present study is confined within the first order $1/S$ expansion, i.e., the spin wave theory. In this scheme, the system is described by a quadratic Hamiltonian of (the Holstein-Primakoff) bosons with zero chemical potential. For the pure system, which will be discussed in detail in the following section, this theory gives the same results as those in the Bogolubov theory for weakly interacting bosons. We study the disordered system in section III. In this case, the random transverse fields $\{h_j\}$ result in both diagonal and off-diagonal disorder for the Holstein-Primakoff bosons. For weak randomness, where perturbation theory is applicable, modifications to the low energy spectrum due to disorder are obtained analytically. We find that in this regime the superfluidity is rather robust against (weak) disorder, as one expects on the physical ground. We conclude our discussions in section IV.

II. PURE SYSTEM

In this section we present the spin wave theory results for the pure system. Consider the quantum XY-model (2) without fields

$$\mathcal{H}^0 = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (S_i^z S_j^z + S_i^x S_j^x) , \quad (3)$$

where we have made a spin rotation for convenience. Assuming the ground state to be ferromagnetic with broken symmetry in the z -direction, the classical ground state is then given by $\langle S_i^z \rangle = S$. Fluctuations about the classical ground state can be studied through the usual Holstein-Primakoff transformation [11], given by

$$\begin{aligned} S_j^+ &= \sqrt{2S}(1 - a_j^\dagger a_j/2S)^{1/2} a_j , \\ S_j^- &= \sqrt{2S} a_j^\dagger (1 - a_j^\dagger a_j/2S)^{1/2} , \\ S_j^z &= S - a_j^\dagger a_j , \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $a_j^\dagger, a_j$ are bosonic creation and annihilation operators. Assuming periodic boundary condition on a d -dimensional hypercubic lattice, in terms of the Fourier transformed variables

$$a_k^\dagger = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j e^{-ikx_j} a_j^\dagger , \quad a_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j e^{ikx_j} a_j , \quad (5)$$

we have, with rescaling $J \rightarrow J/S^2$,

$$\mathcal{H}^0 = -\frac{z}{2}NJ + \frac{zJ}{S} \sum_k a_k^\dagger a_k - \frac{zJ}{4S} \sum_k \gamma_k (a_k^\dagger a_k + a_k a_{-k} + H.c.) + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{S^{3/2}}) , \quad (6)$$

where

$$\gamma_k = \frac{1}{z} \sum_\delta e^{ik\delta} . \quad (7)$$

δ above is the directional unit vector of the lattice, and z is the lattice coordination number.

Ignoring the terms of higher power in $1/S$, the usual Bogoluibov transformation gives

$$\mathcal{H}^0 = E^0 + \sum_k \omega_k^0 b_k^+ b_k , \quad (8)$$

with

$$E^0 = \frac{zJ}{2S} \sum_k (\sqrt{1 - \gamma_k} - 1) - \frac{z}{2}NJ , \quad (9)$$

$$\omega_k^0 = \frac{zJ}{S} \sqrt{1 - \gamma_k} . \quad (10)$$

Here b_k^+ , b_k are the new creation and annihilation operators respectively, with

$$b_k = u_k a_k - v_k a_{-k}^+ , \quad b_k^+ = -v_k a_{-k} + u_k a_k^+ , \quad (11)$$

and

$$u_k^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_k}} + 1 \right) , \quad v_k^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_k}} - 1 \right) , \quad 2u_k v_k = \frac{\frac{\gamma_k}{2}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_k}} . \quad (12)$$

The low energy excitations are magnetic phonons (magnons) with speed of sound $c_s^0 = \sqrt{z}J/S$.

To have some physical feelings about the nature of the low energy excitations, we express the magnon operators in terms of the spin operators (to the leading order of $1/S$):

$$b_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2S}} \left(i(1 - \gamma_k)^{-1/4} S_k^y - (1 - \gamma_k)^{1/4} S_k^x \right) , \quad (13)$$

$$b_k^+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2S}} \left(-i(1 - \gamma_k)^{-1/4} S_k^y - (1 - \gamma_k)^{1/4} S_k^x \right) , \quad (14)$$

where $\vec{S}_k$ is the Fourier transform of $\vec{S}_j$. S_k^x and S_k^y generate out-plane oscillations and in-plane rotations respectively. Above decomposition of the magnon operators shows that while high energy excitations are composed of both kind spin motions, the low energy, long wavelength excitations are dominantly in-plane rotations. The zero mode ($\omega_{k=0}^0 = 0$) is a pure in-plane uniform rotation. As we will see later, such a zero mode also exists in the disordered system.

To calculate the helicity modulus, which is proportional to the superfluid density [12], we impose a phase twist on the order parameter. Let us maintain the periodic boundary condition in the first $d - 1$ directions but impose the anti-periodic boundary condition in the d -th direction for the in-plane component of the spins. Since the spin wave excitations are well defined only with the correct (classical) ground state, we need to determine first the classical ground state under such a boundary condition. It is clear that the spin configuration which gives the lowest energy under such circumstance is the state in which spins are rotated gradually from angle 0 to π in the d -th direction (See the next section for discussions for general situations.). Under such a rotation, spins in each $d - 1$ dimensional plane perpendicular to the axis of the phase twist are rotated by the same amount, and the angular difference of the rotations between two successive planes is π/L , where L is the linear size of the lattice. To apply the Holstein-Primakoff transformation (4), we perform therefore a spin rotation around the y -axis (in the spin space), and the angle of rotation on the spin at site $j = (j_1, \dots, j_{d-1}, j_d)$ is

$$\phi_j = \frac{\pi j_d}{L} . \quad (15)$$

In terms of the rotated spins, (3) with anti-periodic boundary condition becomes

$$\mathcal{H}^0 = -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \left[\cos(\phi_i - \phi_j) (S_i^z S_j^z + S_i^x S_j^x) - \sin(\phi_i - \phi_j) (S_i^z S_j^x - S_i^x S_j^z) \right] . \quad (16)$$

The spin variables in (16) satisfy the periodic boundary condition, and they are ordered in the z -direction in the ground state.

Applying the Holstein-Primakoff transformation (4), and through a procedure similar to that in the case of the periodic boundary condition, we have, to the order $1/S$,

$$\mathcal{H}^0 = E'^0 + \sum_k \omega_k'^0 b_k^\dagger b_k \quad , \quad (17)$$

with

$$E'^0 = \frac{J}{2S} \sum_k \left(\sqrt{(z-2+2\alpha)[(z-2+2\alpha) - (z-2)\gamma_k^\perp - 2\alpha\gamma_k^\parallel]} \right. \\ \left. - (z-2+2\alpha) \right) - \frac{z-2}{2} NJ - \alpha NJ \quad , \quad (18)$$

$$\omega_k'^0 = \frac{J}{S} \sqrt{(z-2+2\alpha)[(z-2+2\alpha) - (z-2)\gamma_k^\perp - 2\alpha\gamma_k^\parallel]} \quad , \quad (19)$$

$$\alpha = \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{L}\right) \quad , \quad \gamma_k^\parallel = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\delta_\parallel} e^{ik\delta_\parallel} \quad , \quad \gamma_k^\perp = \frac{1}{z-2} \sum_{\delta_\perp} e^{ik\delta_\perp} \quad ,$$

and $\parallel, \perp$ are defined with respect to the axis of phase twist.

Compare above results with those obtained with the periodic boundary condition, we see that, by twisting the phase of the order parameter, one lifts the ground state energy of the system but lowers the excitation energy (with respect to the new ground state energy level), i.e., $E'^0 > E^0$, $\omega_k'^0 < \omega_k^0$. Since to the first order of $1/S$ the second term in (16) vanishes, we can think of the effect of changing the boundary condition as a reduction of the spin coupling in the d -th direction, i.e., $J \rightarrow J$ in the first $d-1$ directions and $J \rightarrow \alpha J$ in the d -th direction. Because of this reduction, one loses ground state energy but makes excitations easier. Moreover, since this coupling reduction is anisotropic, the system picks up an easy direction of excitation along the d -axis.

The helicity modulus γ [12] can now be easily calculated from the expressions obtained above:

$$\gamma(T) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} 2 \left(\frac{L}{\pi} \right)^2 \frac{\Delta F}{N} = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} 2 \left(\frac{L}{\pi} \right)^2 \frac{1}{N} \left(\Delta E^0 + \frac{N}{(2\pi)^d} \int d^d k \frac{\Delta \omega_k^0}{e^{\beta \omega_k^0} - 1} \right) \quad , \quad (20)$$

where ΔF refers to the change of free energy as a result of changing boundary condition and $\Delta E^0 = E'^0 - E^0$, $\Delta \omega_k^0 = \omega_k'^0 - \omega_k^0 \propto (\frac{\pi}{L})^2 k$. This gives

$$\gamma(T) = \gamma(0) - a T^{d+1} \quad , \quad (21)$$

where a is a positive constant. This is in agreement with the known result for weakly interacting boson systems [13].

Before we go further, we would like to comment on the validity of the spin wave approach to our problem. In one dimension (1D), the quantum correction to the in-plane magnetization, $\delta m \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \langle a_j^\dagger a_j \rangle$, is divergent [14], reflecting the lack of *true* long range order in the quantum XY model [15]. For two and higher dimensions, it has been shown rigorously that finite magnetization exists in the XY plane [16], and indeed the quantum correction to the classical magnetization in the spin wave theory becomes finite also. The fact that δm decreases with increasing dimensionality indicates that spin wave theory becomes a better approximation in higher dimensions. Notice that despite the divergence in δm , and thus the absence of the condensate, the superfluidity that exists (at zero temperature) in one dimension manifests itself through the linear behavior in low energy excitations.

Finally, we give the spin wave solution for the XY model in a uniform transverse field where $h_j \equiv h_0$. This can be obtained in a similar manner to the procedure for the case of $h_0 = 0$ shown above, with a rescaling $J \rightarrow J/S^2$, $h_0 \rightarrow h_0/S$. Comparison of the results obtained here with those calculated in the presence of the random fields to be described in the next section will help us isolate the effect of disorder. For large field, i.e., for $h_0 \geq zJ$, the classical spins are completely aligned with the transverse field and therefore there is no in-plane magnetization. For weaker field, the classical ground state (with the periodic boundary condition) is given by $\langle S_j^z \rangle = S \cos \theta_0$, $\langle S_j^y \rangle = S \sin \theta_0$, where the transverse field h_0 tilts the (classical) spins with an angle θ_0 such that $\sin \theta_0 = H_0 \equiv h_0/zJ$. The ground state energy

$$E^0(h_0) = \frac{zJ}{2S} \sum_k \sqrt{(1 - \gamma_k)(1 - \gamma_k H_0^2)} - \frac{zJ}{2} N(1 + H_0^2) . \quad (22)$$

The magnon spectrum is modified by h_0 as

$$\omega_k^0(h_0) = \frac{zJ}{S} \sqrt{(1 - \gamma_k)(1 - \gamma_k H_0^2)} . \quad (23)$$

One can compute the out-plane susceptibility $\chi_\perp$ (compressibility in the boson language) by taking second derivative of E^0 :

$$\chi_\perp = \frac{\partial^2 E^0/N}{\partial (h_0/S)^2} \Big|_{h_0=0} = \frac{S^2}{zJ} + \mathcal{O}(S) . \quad (24)$$

The S^2 term is simply the classical result, and the rest are corrections due to quantum fluctuations. Since the classical contribution to $\gamma(0)$ is just J , we calculate the speed of sound

$$c_s^2 = \frac{\gamma(0)}{\chi_\perp} = \frac{zJ^2}{S^2} , \quad (25)$$

in agreement with the result obtained earlier. We see that from pure classical considerations one can obtain c_s which characterizes the quantum nature of the low energy excitations.

Not surprisingly the speed of sound is reduced by h_0 , with $c_s^0(h_0) = c_s^0 \sqrt{1 - H_0^2}$. However, it is less obvious that the (relative) quantum correction to the in-plane magnetization

$$\frac{\delta m(h_0)}{S \cos \theta_0} = \frac{1}{NS} \sum_k \langle a_k^\dagger a_k \rangle = \frac{1}{2S} \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}(1 + H_0^2)}{\sqrt{(1 - \gamma_k)(1 - \gamma_k H_0^2)}} - 1 \right) , \quad (26)$$

is also reduced, i.e., $\frac{\delta m(h_0)}{S \cos \theta_0} < \frac{\delta m(0)}{S}$. This suggests that the reduction of $\langle S_j^z \rangle$ by a uniform transverse field is mainly a classical effect, resulted from the tilting of spins off the ZX (XY in the original coordinate system) plane by h_0 . In fact, as $H_0 \rightarrow 1$, so that $\cos \theta_0 \rightarrow 0$, $\delta m / S \cos \theta_0 \rightarrow 0$, which helps to explain why the critical value of H_0 is just the classical value. We will compare this with the effect of random fields as we proceed.

In summary, the quantum XY model provides us a useful representation of the boson problem in studying the physics of superfluidity. In the large S theory, the expansion parameter $1/S$ contains both the effect of the repulsive interactions between bosons and the effect of quantum zero point fluctuations. We have shown that for the pure system the quadratic fluctuations represented in the first order $1/S$ (spin wave) theory gives the same physics as that described in the Bogoliubov theory for weakly interacting bosons. Now we apply this method to study the disordered case.

III. DISORDERED SYSTEM

Consider the disordered system (with periodic boundary condition) given by

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{J}{S^2} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (S_i^z S_j^z + S_i^x S_j^x) - \sum_j \frac{h_j}{S} S_j^y , \quad (27)$$

with

$$\overline{h_j} = 0 \quad , \quad \overline{h_i h_j} = \delta_{ij} h^2 \quad . \quad (28)$$

In (27), we have made the rescaling $J \rightarrow J/S^2$, $h_j \rightarrow h_j/S$. The overline indicates average over the random transverse fields. The choice of $\overline{h_j} = 0$ corresponds to a ‘particle-hole symmetry’ in the boson system. For hard-core bosons, it corresponds to an average occupancy of half particle per site. Assume that spins in the ground state of the pure (classical) system are ordered in the z -direction, the transverse random fields along the y -axis then tilt each (classical) spin according to the equation of motion (with $\vec{S}_j^{classical} = S(0, \sin\theta_j, \cos\theta_j)$):

$$\sin\theta_j J \sum_{\langle j' \rangle} \cos\theta_{j'} = h_j \cos\theta_j \quad , \quad (29)$$

where $\langle j' \rangle$ indicates nearest neighbors of the site j . Now we perform a local rotation of the (quantum) spin $\vec{S}_j$ over an angle θ_j about the x -axis so that the classical ground state is uniformly ordered in the z -axis in terms of the rotated spins. After the rotation (27) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} = & -\frac{J}{S^2} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (S_i^x S_j^x + \cos\theta_i \cos\theta_j S_i^z S_j^z + \sin\theta_i \sin\theta_j S_i^y S_j^y \\ & - \sin\theta_i \cos\theta_j S_i^y S_j^z - \cos\theta_i \sin\theta_j S_i^z S_j^y) - \sum_j \frac{h_j}{S} (\sin\theta_j S_j^z + \cos\theta_j S_j^y) \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Applying the Holstein-Primakoff transformation (4) now, together with (29), one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} = & -J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \cos\theta_i \cos\theta_j - \sum_j h_j \sin\theta_j - \frac{J}{2S} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} [(1 - \sin\theta_i \sin\theta_j) a_i a_j + \\ & (1 + \sin\theta_i \sin\theta_j) a_i^\dagger a_j + H.c.] + \frac{1}{S} \sum_j \frac{h_j}{\sin\theta_j} a_j^\dagger a_j + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{S^{3/2}}) \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Rewrite (31) in terms of Fourier transformed variables, we have

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}^0 + \mathcal{H}^1 \quad , \quad (32)$$

with $\mathcal{H}^0$ given by (6) and

$$\mathcal{H}^1 = E^{10} + \sum_{k,k'} u_{k-k'} a_k^\dagger a_{k'} + \sum_{k,k'} (v_{-k,-k'} a_k a_{k'} - v_{k,-k'} a_k^\dagger a_{k'} + H.c) \quad , \quad (33)$$

where

$$E^{10} = J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} (1 - \cos\theta_i \cos\theta_j) - \sum_j h_j \sin\theta_j \quad , \quad (34)$$

$$u_k = \frac{1}{NS} \sum_j \left(\frac{h_j}{\sin\theta_j} - zJ \right) e^{ikx_j} \quad , \quad (35)$$

$$v_{k,k'} = \frac{J}{2NS} \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} \sin\theta_i \sin\theta_j e^{i(kx_i + k'x_j)} \quad . \quad (36)$$

In the weak disorder limit, $\mathcal{H}^1$ may be considered as a perturbation to $\mathcal{H}^0$.

In stead of carrying out a Bogoluibov type transformation, which becomes non-local and depends on the configuration of the random fields in the disordered case, we compute poles of the propagator $\overline{\langle \mathcal{T}[a_k(t)a_k^\dagger(0)] \rangle}$ ($\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes the ground state expectation value and $\mathcal{T}$ indicates time ordering.). These poles are directly related to the excitation spectrum of the system. To this end, we consider

$$F(k, k'; t) \equiv -i \begin{pmatrix} \langle \mathcal{T}[a_k(t)a_{k'}^\dagger(0)] \rangle \\ \langle \mathcal{T}[a_{-k}^\dagger(t)a_{k'}^\dagger(0)] \rangle \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (37)$$

which obeys the equation of motion

$$\left(i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - T_k \right) F(k, k'; t) = \delta(t) \delta_{kk'} E_1 + \sum_{k''} U_{k,k''} F(k'', k'; t) \quad , \quad (38)$$

where

$$T_k = \frac{zJ}{S} \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} & -\frac{\gamma_k}{2} \\ \frac{\gamma_k}{2} & -(1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}) \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad E_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (39)$$

and

$$U_{k,k'} = \begin{pmatrix} u_{k-k'} - v_{k,-k'} - v_{-k',k} & v_{k,-k'} + v_{-k',k} \\ -(v_{k,-k'} + v_{-k',k}) & -(u_{k-k'} - v_{k,-k'} - v_{-k',k}) \end{pmatrix} \quad . \quad (40)$$

Applying the Fourier transformation in time, with

$$F(k, k'; \omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt F(k, k'; t) e^{i\omega t} \quad , \quad (41)$$

we have

$$(\omega - T_k)F(k, k'; \omega) = \delta_{kk'}E_1 + \sum_{k''} U_{k,k''} F(k'', k'; \omega) , \quad (42)$$

or

$$F(k, k'; \omega) = (\omega - T_k)^{-1} \delta_{kk'} E_1 + (\omega - T_k)^{-1} \sum_{k''} U_{k,k''} F(k'', k'; \omega) . \quad (43)$$

For the pure system, $U_{k,k'} = 0$, we have

$$F^0(k, k'; \omega) = \tilde{F}^0(k, \omega) \delta_{k,k'} E_1 \equiv G^0(k, \omega) , \quad (44)$$

with

$$\tilde{F}^0(k, \omega) \equiv (\omega - T_k)^{-1} = \frac{1}{D^0(k, \omega)} \begin{pmatrix} \omega + \frac{zJ}{S}(1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}) & -\frac{zJ}{S} \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \\ \frac{zJ}{S} \frac{\gamma_k}{2} & \omega - \frac{zJ}{S}(1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}) \end{pmatrix} , \quad (45)$$

and

$$\frac{1}{D^0(k, \omega)} = \frac{1}{(\omega - \omega_k^0 + i\eta)(\omega + \omega_k^0 - i\eta)} , \quad \eta \rightarrow 0^+ . \quad (46)$$

This gives

$$G^0(k, \omega) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{u_k^2}{\omega - \omega_k^0 + i\eta} - \frac{v_k^2}{\omega + \omega_k^0 - i\eta} \\ u_k v_k \left(\frac{1}{\omega - \omega_k^0 + i\eta} - \frac{1}{\omega + \omega_k^0 - i\eta} \right) \end{pmatrix} , \quad (47)$$

where u_k and v_k are given by (12). Thus, from the poles in $G^0(k, \omega)$, we have recovered the excitation spectrum obtained earlier through the Bogoluibov transformation.

For disordered system, one can iterate (43) to find a perturbative solution for $F(k, k'; \omega)$. $U_{k,k'}$ contains randomness that needs to be averaged out. It depends on the random fields $\{h_j\}$ both explicitly and implicitly in $\{\theta_j\}$ through (29). For weak randomness, where $h \ll zJ$, one can solve (29) order by order (see the appendix). One has, in the regime of weak disorder,

$$G(k, \omega) \equiv \overline{F(k, k; \omega)} = (\tilde{F}^{0-1}(k, \omega) - \Sigma^*(k, \omega))^{-1} E_1 \quad (48)$$

where the self energy $\Sigma^*(k, \omega)$ is given by

$$\Sigma^*(k, \omega) = \overline{U_{k,k}} + \sum_{k'} \overline{U_{k,k'} \tilde{F}^0(k', \omega) U_{k',k}} . \quad (49)$$

The detailed algebraic expression of $\Sigma^*(k, \omega)$ is given in the appendix. This is consistent with a perturbation expansion for the self energy to the order h^4 (see the appendix). Notice that in real space $U_{k,k'}$ is not just a random on-site potential. It contains both (correlated) diagonal and off-diagonal disorder.

The poles of $G(k, \omega)$ are given by (A15) when the distribution of the random fields is Gaussian, which can be computed analytically for 1D system. As discussed earlier, while the divergence in δm indicates the instability of the classical ground state and thus the absence of true long range order in the quantum system, the linear behavior in ω_k^0 at small k indicates the existence of the superfluidity at zero temperature. It is therefore meaningful to investigate deviations from ω_k^0 due to disorder in 1D systems within the present approach. To the order h^4 , the poles of $G(k, \omega)$ are given by (with $z = 2$)

$$\omega = \omega_k = \omega_k^0 \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h}{zJ} \right)^4 A(k) \right] , \quad (50)$$

with

$$\text{Re}\{A\} = \frac{1}{4} + 5\cos k - 3\cos^3 k + \cos^4 k , \quad (51)$$

$$\text{Im}\{A\} = \frac{(2 - \cos k)^2}{2} |\sin k| (1 + \cos k) + (1 + \cos^2 k) \frac{1 - \cos k}{4|\sin k|} . \quad (52)$$

We see that the linear mode persists at low energy with a reduced speed of sound $c_s = c_s^0 (1 - \frac{13}{8} (\frac{h}{zJ})^4)$. It has been shown [4] that for $S = 1/2$ any amount of disorder will change the power law behavior of the spin-spin correlation function to an exponential one, corresponding to the instability of superfluidity in the 1D hard-core boson system. For systems with soft-core bosons, which are roughly described by (2) with $S > 1/2$, renormalization group study [17] shows that superfluidity may persist in the presence of (weak) disorder, if the value of an exponent η of the correlation function in the corresponding pure system is less than a

critical value $\eta_c = 1/3$. The fact that in our calculations the linear mode persists in the weak disorder limit suggests that present $1/S$ theory describes systems with $S > S_c$ such that the exponent $\eta < \eta_c$. The imaginary part of the pole diverges at the zone boundary ($k = \pm\pi$), indicating vanishing life time of these (Bloch) modes. By analyzing the scattering rate of the Bloch phonons using Fermi's golden rule, this divergence can be interpreted as the divergence of the density of states in one dimension. In 2D, the imaginary part has a (van Hove) singularity at the band center, and it behaves regularly in higher dimensions.

For an arbitrary dimension d , the correction to the speed of sound is given by

$$c_s = c_s^0 \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{h}{zJ} \right)^4 A(0) \right) , \quad (53)$$

with

$$A(0) = \frac{3z+3}{2z} + \mathcal{P} \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{\frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{j=1}^d \sin^2 k_j}{1 - \gamma_k} . \quad (54)$$

The imaginary part of $D(k, \omega) \equiv \det(\tilde{F}^{0-1} - \Sigma^*)$ vanishes for small k and ω as ω^{d+2} (see the appendix), implying a decay rate of phonons $\tau^{-1} \propto \omega^{d+1}$, and the mean free path $l = c_s \tau \propto k^{-(d+1)}$. Thus for small k , $kl \gg 1$. This implies that momentum is still approximately conserved. We see that both the reduction of the sound speed and the decay of phonons become weaker in higher dimensions. Notice that this is not a time decay rate for phonons, which can only be nonzero through multi-phonon scattering, but is just the scattering rate for a Bloch phonon. Since the scattering is elastic, energy conservation implies $\tau^{-1} \propto \omega^{d-1}$, the extra suppression factor of ω^2 is presumably a reflection that there always exists a zero frequency mode which corresponds to uniform rotation in the ordering plane. Since for small ω , $\omega\tau \gg 1$, the Bloch modes remain robust in the presence of weak disorder. The fact that the zero mode ($\omega_{k=0} = 0$) has zero imaginary part shows that it remains to be an exact eigenmode of the Hamiltonian in the disordered system.

Next we study the effect of disorder on the magnitude of the order parameter, which corresponds to the square root of the condensate density in the boson language. It is given by

$$m = \overline{< S_i^z >} = \frac{1}{N} \overline{\sum_j \cos\theta_j (S - < a_j^\dagger a_j >)} , \quad (55)$$

which can simply be understood as following: the first term gives the reduction in m due to the tilt of the classical spins from the ordering plane. The second term shows that each Holstein-Primakoff boson lowers the spin along z' -axis by one, and hence only by $\cos\theta_j$ along the z -axis. Thus to the order h^2

$$\begin{aligned} m &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_j \overline{\cos\theta_j} (S - \frac{1}{N} \sum_k < a_k^\dagger a_k >) \\ &= (1 - \frac{1}{2}(\frac{h}{zJ})^2) \left(S - \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} (\frac{1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_k}} - 1) \right) , \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

where $< a_k^\dagger a_k >_0$ is the expectation value with respect to $\mathcal{H}^0$ (since $\overline{\delta < a_k^\dagger a_k >}$ vanishes to order h^2 , see (A21).).

Again let $m = m_{\text{classical}} - \delta m$, where $m_{\text{classical}}$ is the classical ($S \rightarrow \infty$) condensate, and δm is the reduction due to quantum fluctuations. In the pure case where $h_j = h_0$ and $\theta_j = \theta_0$, we have seen that besides the ‘classical’ factor $\cos\theta_0$, δm is also reduced by H_0 , resulting in a net reduction of $\delta m/m_{\text{classical}}$ by a uniform field. This is in contrast to that in the random system considered here, where $\delta m/m_{\text{classical}}$ is independent of the disorder to order h^2 . While δm is reduced by disorder to order h^2 , indicating that disorder and quantum fluctuations have opposing effects on the condensate density, it will not be the case to higher order in h , and that δm will also be enhanced by disorder. To order h^4 , we have (see the appendix)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta m}{m_{\text{classical}}} &= \frac{1}{2S} \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_k}} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{4S} (\frac{h}{zJ})^4 \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_k}} \\ &\quad \left\{ \frac{\gamma_k}{2} (\tilde{I}_2(k) - \tilde{I}_3(k)) + \frac{1}{z} \tilde{I}_1(k) - \frac{(1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2})^2 (1 + \tilde{I}_2(k))}{1 - \gamma_k} + 1 - \sqrt{1 - \gamma_k} \tilde{I}_2(k) \right\} , \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where $\tilde{I}_1(k)$, $\tilde{I}_2(k)$ and $\tilde{I}_3(k)$ are given in the appendix. The fact that the second term in the right hand side of (57) is positive suggests that disorder enhances quantum fluctuations.

One can calculate the helicity modulus in a similar way as one does for the pure model. In the disordered case, the effective Hamiltonian for phonons become considerably more

complicated for a system with anti-periodic boundary condition. For classical spins, the equations for the ground state are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sin\theta_j \sum_{\langle j' \rangle} \cos\phi_{j'} \cos\theta_{j'} &= \frac{h_j}{J} \cos\phi_j \cos\theta_j , \\ \sin\phi_j \sum_{\langle j' \rangle} \cos\phi_{j'} \cos\theta_{j'} &= \cos\phi_j \sum_{\langle j' \rangle} \sin\phi_{j'} \cos\theta_{j'} , \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where the classical spin is defined by $\vec{S}_j^{classical} = S(\sin\phi_j \cos\theta_j, \sin\theta_j, \cos\phi_j \cos\theta_j)$. Obviously, we expect the phase twist to be large where the tilt of the spins away from the ordering plane is large and vice versa. For a general random field distribution, (58) may be solved numerically. The helicity modulus

$$\gamma(T=0) = J(1 - a(\frac{h}{zJ})^2 + \mathcal{O}(h^4)) , \quad (59)$$

with $a > 0$. In the special case where $\{h_j\}$ is given by a bimodal distribution, $P(h_j) = \frac{1}{2}(\delta(h_j - h_0) + \delta(h_j + h_0))$, the solution for $\{\phi_j\}$ in (58) is the same as that for a uniform field h_0 , and $a = 1$. Since there is no shift in the phonon spectrum to the order h^2 , there is no quantum correction to γ to that order in the disorder. One might ask if the (low) temperature dependence of γ is affected by the disorder. However, since the low energy excitation remains to be phonon like, the density of state $N(\omega) \propto \omega^{d-1}$, assuming that the single mode approximation remains intact. This implies (see (21)) that the T^{d+1} behavior of the temperature dependence of the helicity modulus should be unaltered by the presence of weak disorder.

To summarize our results, we find that to the lowest non-vanishing order in h/zJ , and relative to the pure system, the speed of sound is reduced ($\delta c_s \propto (\frac{h}{zJ})^4$), the condensate density is reduced classically, but unaltered quantum mechanically, while the superfluid density is reduced classically, but remains unchanged quantum mechanically. To higher order of h , disorder tends to enhance quantum fluctuations.

So far we considered only a special case where $\overline{h_j} \equiv h_0 = 0$. In general, h_0 is nonzero and instead of (A1), we have

$$\theta_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_k e^{-ikx_j} \frac{\sqrt{1-H_0^2}}{1-\gamma_k H_0^2} \frac{h_k}{zJ} + \mathcal{O}(h^2) , \quad (60)$$

with

$$h_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j e^{-ikx_j} h_j , H_0 = \frac{h_0}{zJ} .$$

Compare with (A1), we see that the primary role of a non-vanishing h_0 is to introduce correlations among θ_j 's. Calculation with finite h_0 is more complicated. To see physics, however, one can consider the case of correlated randomness. Thus, we consider (28) with

$$\overline{h_j} = 0 , \quad \overline{h_i h_j} = f(|x_i - x_j|) . \quad (61)$$

where $f(x)$ is some arbitrary function. To the lowest order, poles of the Green function (48) are given by

$$\omega^2 = \left(\frac{zJ}{S}\right)^2 (1 - \gamma_k) \left(1 - \gamma_k \left(\frac{\tilde{h}}{zJ}\right)^2\right) , \quad (62)$$

where $\tilde{h}^2$ is the average of a pair of random field at nearest neighbor, $\overline{h_j h_{j+\delta}} = \tilde{h}^2$. Thus, in the weak randomness limit, correlated random fields reduce the excitation energy, and hence the speed of sound in the same manner as a uniform field (see (23)), and do not induce finite scattering rate for the Bloch phonons at the lowest order. (Note that in (62) only the nearest neighbor correlation in h_j matters.)

IV. DISCUSSIONS

As remarked previously, our approximation consists of a double expansion in $1/S$ and the strength of disorder h about a saddle point solution of (27) which becomes exact in the classical ($S = \infty$) limit. Now we re-examine this approximation scheme in terms of the original boson Hamiltonian (1). In terms of the *hard-core* boson operators, the classical spin ground state described by (29) corresponds to a Gutzwiller-type trial wavefunction [18]:

$$|\Psi_G\rangle = \prod_j (\sin\varphi_j + \cos\varphi_j b_j^+) |0\rangle , \quad (63)$$

with $\varphi_j = \pi/4 - \theta_j/2$. Minimizing the energy $E = \langle \Psi_G | \mathcal{H} | \Psi_G \rangle$ with respect to $\{\theta_j\}$, one recovers (29). In this state, the order parameter

$$b \equiv \frac{1}{N} \overline{\langle \Psi_G | \sum_j b_j | \Psi_G \rangle} = \frac{1}{2N} \overline{\sum_j \cos \theta_j} , \quad (64)$$

which is equivalent to the in-plane magnetization of the classical spins (with $S = 1/2$) considered previously. The quantum fluctuations described by the spin-wave theory correspond to the Gaussian fluctuations about this Gutzwiller state. Within this scheme, our perturbative calculation shows that the low energy Bloch modes are rather robust, and disorder has little effect on the long wavelength quantum mechanical behavior of the system. We cannot, however, rule out the possibility of a stronger effect of disorder (e.g. a $\hbar^2$ correction to the speed of sound) as one goes to higher orders of $1/S$. At higher orders of $1/S$, phonon-phonon scatterings take place and cause decay of these quasi-particles. Presumably such decay processes are stronger than those of the Bloch phonons in the corresponding pure system due to disorder enhanced quantum fluctuations. How does disorder enhance these fluctuation effects is an important question that yet to be investigated.

Our perturbative study shows that superfluidity is rather insensitive to the presence of weak disorder. This result is fully in agreement with what one would expect intuitively: since superfluidity is due to quantum coherence on the macroscopic scale, superfluid should be rigid against weak impurity scatterings. A similar statement for fermion systems is expressed in the content of the Anderson Theorem for the BCS superconductors with weak homogeneous non-magnetic impurities [19]. A natural question to be asked is then how would the system evolve with increasing randomness. At zero temperature, as disorder becomes stronger, or as effects of interaction and quantum zero point fluctuations become more important, or both, one may reach a point where a transition from the superfluid phase to a disordered (Bose glass) phase takes place. Since in the Bose glass phase the low energy excitations are single particle like, one may expect that the speed of sound, which characterizes the low energy excitations of the superfluid phase, vanishes at that point. Thus the transition point can be located naively by setting c_s in (53) to zero, which gives

$$\frac{1}{2}(\frac{\hbar}{zJ})^4 A(0) = 1 \quad . \quad (65)$$

Of course, long before this point is reached our (weak disorder) approximation loses its legitimacy. However, it is still a non-trivial and interesting question that whether the Gaussian fluctuations contained in the first order $1/S$ expansion are capable to describe such a phase transition. Since this approach is based upon an expansion about the ordered phase, phase transition is expected to be signaled by instabilities of the expansion, such as appearance of negative energy modes or strong divergence of quantum zero point fluctuation corrections. The present weak disorder calculation cannot answer such questions concerning strong disorder, but this approach does provide a scheme for further investigations. Since the effective Hamiltonian is quadratic to the first order of $1/S$, exact numerical diagonalizations are possible for finite systems upto sizes which are unreachable otherwise. Thus it provides us a way of study the low energy excitation spectrum in the strong disordered system. This will be discussed in a forth coming work [20]. Of course, such a study can only address these questions within the Gaussian scheme. Other than simply having a vanishing speed of sound, there are different possibilities for the phonon mode to evolve into the single particle continuum as the system is tuned into the disordered phase. For instance, c_s may remain finite while phonon decays strongly with increasing disorder so that its spectral weight vanishes at the transition point. How precisely the phonon mode evolves with increasing randomness is still an open question which can only be answered by going beyond the Gaussian approximation.

In conclusion, we have found that the spin representation of the boson problem is an effective approach for investigating the effect of disorder. Within the Gaussian approximation, our perturbative study shows that the superfluidity remains robust in the presence of weak disorder, while random fields have scatterings with Bloch phonons with a rate proportional to ω^{d+1} and give a weak reduction of the speed of sound. Our calculations also suggest that stronger disorder tends to enhance quantum fluctuations which may eventually cause the destruction of superfluidity [2].

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank M. Ma for numerous valuable discussions and comments, and for his critical reading of the manuscript. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMR-9101542.

APPENDIX A

In this appendix we evaluate the self energy $\Sigma^*(k, \omega)$ to order h^4 . Assuming h is small, one can solve (18) perturbatively. To the lowest order of h_j , θ_j is simply given by $H_j \equiv h_j/zJ$. To the next order, one has

$$\theta_j = H_j \left(1 - \frac{1}{3}H_j^2 + \frac{1}{2z} \sum_{\langle j' \rangle} H_{j'}^2 + \dots\right) . \quad (\text{A1})$$

Here we see that θ_j starts to couple to the field at the neighbor sites as one goes to higher order of h_j . We calculate the quantities

$$\overline{u_0} = \frac{zJ}{4S}(\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2) , \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\overline{u_k u_{-k}} = \left(\frac{zJ}{S}\right)^2 \frac{1}{4N} (1 - \gamma_k)^2 (\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2) , \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\overline{(v_{k,-k'} + v_{-k',k})(v_{k',-k} + v_{-k,k'})} = \left(\frac{zJ}{S}\right)^2 \frac{1}{4zN} (1 + \gamma_{k+k'}) (\overline{H^2})^2 , \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $\overline{H^n}$ is the n -th moment of H_j . With these results, the self energy

$$\Sigma^*(k, \omega) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11}^*(k, \omega) & \Sigma_{12}^*(k, \omega) \\ \Sigma_{21}^*(k, \omega) & \Sigma_{22}^*(k, \omega) \end{pmatrix} , \quad (\text{A5})$$

is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{11}^*(k, \omega) = & \frac{zJ}{4S}(\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2) + \left(\frac{zJ}{2S}\right)^2 \frac{1}{N}(\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2) \sum_{k'} [(\omega + \frac{zJ}{S}(1 - \frac{\gamma_{k'}}{2})) \\ & \frac{(1 - \gamma_{k-k'})^2}{D^0(k', \omega)}] + \left(\frac{zJ}{2S}\right)^2 \frac{2}{zN}(\overline{H^2})^2 \sum_{k'} \frac{zJ}{S}(1 - \gamma_{k'}) \frac{1 + \gamma_{k-k'}}{D^0(k', \omega)} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{22}^*(k, \omega) = & -\frac{zJ}{4S}(\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2) + \left(\frac{zJ}{2S}\right)^2 \frac{1}{N}(\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2) \sum_{k'} [(\omega - \frac{zJ}{S}(1 - \frac{\gamma_{k'}}{2})) \\ & \frac{(1 - \gamma_{k-k'})^2}{D^0(k', \omega)}] - \left(\frac{zJ}{2S}\right)^2 \frac{2}{zN}(\overline{H^2})^2 \sum_{k'} \frac{zJ}{S}(1 - \gamma_{k'}) \frac{1 + \gamma_{k-k'}}{D^0(k', \omega)} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{12}^*(k, \omega) = -\Sigma_{21}^*(k, \omega) = & \left(\frac{zJ}{2S}\right)^2 \frac{1}{N}(\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2) \sum_{k'} \frac{zJ}{S} \frac{\gamma_{k'}}{2} \frac{(1 - \gamma_{k-k'})^2}{D^0(k', \omega)} \\ & - \left(\frac{zJ}{2S}\right)^2 \frac{2}{zN}(\overline{H^2})^2 \sum_{k'} \frac{zJ}{S}(1 - \gamma_{k'}) \frac{1 + \gamma_{k-k'}}{D^0(k', \omega)} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

with $D^0(k, \omega)$ given by (46). Since

$$(\tilde{F}^{0-1} - \Sigma^*)^{-1} = \frac{1}{D(k, \omega)} \begin{pmatrix} \omega + \frac{zJ}{S}(1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}) - \Sigma_{22}^* & -(\frac{zJ}{S}\frac{\gamma_k}{2} - \Sigma_{12}^*) \\ (\frac{zJ}{S}\frac{\gamma_k}{2} + \Sigma_{21}^*) & \omega - \frac{zJ}{S}(1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}) - \Sigma_{11}^* \end{pmatrix} , \quad (\text{A9})$$

the poles in $G(k, \omega)$ is given by the zero's in

$$\begin{aligned} D(k, \omega) \equiv \det(\tilde{F}^{0-1} - \Sigma^*) = & \omega^2 \left[1 - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{zJ}{S}\right)^2 (\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2) I_2(k, \omega) \right] \\ & - \left(\frac{zJ}{S}\right)^2 (1 - \gamma_k) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{zJ}{S}\right)^2 (\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2) (1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}) (1 + \left(\frac{zJ}{S}\right)^2 I_2(k, \omega)) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{zJ}{S}\right)^4 (\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2) (1 - \gamma_k) I_3(k, \omega) - \frac{1}{z} \left(\frac{zJ}{S}\right)^4 (\overline{H^2})^2 (1 - \gamma_k) I_1(k, \omega) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A10})$$

with

$$I_1(k, \omega) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k'} \frac{(1 - \gamma_{k'}) (1 + \gamma_{k-k'})}{D^0(k', \omega)} , \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$I_2(k, \omega) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k'} \frac{(1 - \gamma_{k-k'})^2}{D^0(k', \omega)} , \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$I_3(k, \omega) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k'} \frac{\gamma_{k'}}{2} \frac{(1 - \gamma_{k-k'})^2}{D^0(k', \omega)} . \quad (\text{A13})$$

When the distribution of random fields is Gaussian,

$$\overline{H^4} - (\overline{H^2})^2 = 2 \left(\frac{h}{zJ}\right)^4 . \quad (\text{A14})$$

To the order $\mathcal{O}(h^4)$, one can substitute ω in I_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) by ω_k^0 . Since we are only interested in the case where $\omega > 0$, we may ignore the singularities for negative ω . We have

$$\omega^2 = \omega_k^{02} \left[1 + \left(\frac{h}{zJ} \right)^4 \left(\tilde{I}_2(k) + \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2} \right) \frac{1 + \tilde{I}_2(k)}{1 - \gamma_k} - \tilde{I}_3(k) + \frac{1}{z} \tilde{I}_1(k) \right) \right] , \quad (\text{A15})$$

where $(\eta \rightarrow 0^+)$

$$\tilde{I}_1(k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k'} \frac{(1 - \gamma_{k'})(1 + \gamma_{k-k'})}{\gamma_{k'} - \gamma_k + i\eta} , \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$\tilde{I}_2(k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k'} \frac{(1 - \gamma_{k-k'})^2}{\gamma_{k'} - \gamma_k + i\eta} , \quad (\text{A17})$$

$$\tilde{I}_3(k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k'} \frac{\gamma_{k'}}{2} \frac{(1 - \gamma_{k-k'})^2}{\gamma_{k'} - \gamma_k + i\eta} . \quad (\text{A18})$$

To the order of ω^2 and k^2 ,

$$\omega^2 = \omega_k^{02} \left(1 - \left(\frac{h}{zJ} \right)^4 \left(\frac{3z+3}{2z} + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k'} \frac{\frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{j=1}^d \sin^2 k'_j}{1 - \gamma_{k'} - i\eta} \right) \right) , \quad (\text{A19})$$

which implies a correction to the speed of sound due to disorder shown in eqn. (53). The imaginary part of (A10) is of the order ω^{d+2} , which can be seen through a simple dimensional analysis. This gives the life time of phonons $\propto \omega^{-(d+1)}$.

To study the effect of disorder on the quantum corrections to the order parameter (57), one needs to compute

$$\overline{\langle a_j^+ a_j \rangle} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_k \overline{\langle a_k^+ a_k \rangle} = \frac{i}{N} \sum_k \int \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} E_1^+ G(k, \omega) e^{i\omega 0^+} . \quad (\text{A20})$$

Using the result for G obtained above, and completing the ω integral by the usual contour integration over the semicircle at the lower half complex plane, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\langle a_j^+ a_j \rangle} &= \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \left(\frac{1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2}}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_k}} - 1 \right) + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{h}{zJ} \right)^4 \int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \gamma_k}} \\ &\quad \left\{ \frac{\gamma_k}{2} (\tilde{I}_2(k) - \tilde{I}_3(k) + \frac{1}{z} \tilde{I}_1(k)) - \frac{(1 - \frac{\gamma_k}{2})^2 (1 + \tilde{I}_2(k))}{1 - \gamma_k} + 1 - \sqrt{1 - \gamma_k} \tilde{I}_2(k) \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A21})$$

One can verify numerically that the second term is positive. From this result, it is easy to show that the relative quantum correction to the order parameter is given by (57).

REFERENCES

- [1] B.C. Cooker, E. Hebard, E.N. Smith, Y. Takano and J.D. Reppy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **51**, 666 (1983); M.H.W. Chan, K.I. Blum, S.Q. Murphy, G.K.S. Wong and J.D. Reppy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **61**, 1950 (1988); D. Finotello, K.A. Gillis, A. Wong and M.H.W. Chan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **61**, 1954 (1988); G.K.S. Wong, P.A. Crowell, H.A. Cho and J.D. Reppy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **65**, 2410 (1990); M. Larson, N. Mulders and G. Ahlers, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **68**, 3896 (1992).
- [2] M. Ma, B.I. Halperin and P.A. Lee, *Phys. Rev. B*, **34**, 3136 (1986).
- [3] M.P.A. Fisher, P.B. Weichman, G. Grinstein and D.S. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B*, **40**, 546 (1989).
- [4] L. Zhang and M. Ma, *Phys. Rev. A*, **37**, 960 (1988).
- [5] L. Zhang and M. Ma, *Phys. Rev. B*, **45**, 4855 (1992); L. Zhang, X.Q. Wang, *To be published in Phys. Rev. B*.
- [6] K.G. Singh and D.S. Rokhsar, *Phys. Rev. B*, **46**, 3002 (1992).
- [7] K. Runge, *Phys. Rev. B*, **45**, 13136 (1992).
- [8] W. Krauth and N. Trivedi, *Europhys. Lett.* **14**, 627 (1991); N. Trivedi, D.M. Ceperley, and W. Krauth and N. Trivedi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **67**, 2307 (1991); R.T. Scalettar, G.G. Batrouni, and G.T. Zimanyi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **66**, 3144 (1991); E.S. Sorensen, M. Wallin, S.M. Girvin and A.P. Young, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **69**, 828 (1992).
- [9] M.P.A. Fisher, G. Grinstein and S.M. Girvin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **64**, 587 (1990); M.C. Cha, M.P.A. Fisher, S.M. Girvin, M. Wallin, and A.P. Young, *Phys. Rev. B*, **44**, 6883 (1991).
- [10] Y. Liu, K.A. McGreer, B. Nease, D.B. Haviland, G. Martinez, J.W. Halley, and A.M. Goldman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **67**, 2068 (1991); D.B. Haviland, Y. Liu and A.M. Goldman,

Phys. Rev. Lett., **62**, 2180 (1989).

- [11] T. Holstein and H. Primakoff, *Phys. Rev.*, **58**, 1908 (1940).
- [12] M.E. Fisher, M.N. Barber and D. Jasnow, *Phys. Rev. A*, **8**, 1111 (1973).
- [13] E.M. Lifshitz and L.P. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics (Part 2)*, Pergamon Press (1980);
G.D. Mahan, *Many Particle Physics* Plenum, 2nd Edition, (1990).
- [14] G. Gomez-Santos and J.D. Joannoloulos, *Phys. Rev. B* , **36**, 8707 (1987).
- [15] E. Lieb, T. Schultz and D. Mattis, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)*, **16**, 407 (1961).
- [16] T. Kennedy, E.H. Lieb and B.S. Shastry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* , **61**, 2582 (1988).
- [17] T. Giamarchi and H.J. Schulz, *Phys. Rev. B*, **37**, 325 (1988).
- [18] This interpretation of the classical spin ground state was pointed out to the author by M. Ma.
- [19] P.W. Anderson, *J. Phys. Chem. Solid*, **11**, 26 (1959); See also M. Ma and P.A. Lee, *Phys. Rev. B*, **32**, 5658 (1985).
- [20] P. Nisamaneephong, M. Ma and L. Zhang, *unpublished*.